

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 are pending in the application. It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 5, 7 and 8 have been allowed. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hama et al. (U.S. Patent 6,944,481) in view of JP 2002064599 to Yamada, and further in view of the newly cited reference of Bradley et al. (U.S. Patent 5,805,067).

Claim 1 has been amended for further clarification. No new matter has been added.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a), the Examiner states that Hama et al. in view of Yamada discloses all subject matter recited in Claim 1, except first and second lamps for left-turn and right-turn indication. However, the Examiner asserts that Bradley et al. teaches this feature, and states that Claim 1 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made.

Claim 1 relates a mobile communication terminal for indicating an incoming call, a left-turn and a right-turn simultaneously *by changing the colors* of the first and second lamps, not a portable satellite phone having a visual alarm device merely using LEDs as described in Bradley et al. More particularly, the second lamp emits a color different than a color emitted by the first lamp when the terminal is in a GPS mode and the first lamp indicates a left-turn or right-turn as recited in Claim 1, thereby providing the incoming call notification information even while GPS information is being displayed, by controlling the colors of the lamps. However, Bradley simply describes a satellite phone with GPS, four LEDs to indicate North, South, East and West (col. 3, lines 57 – col. 4, line 19) and visual alarm device having LEDs (col. 8, lines 36-44). That is, the combination of Hama et al., Yamada and Bradley et al. does not disclose that the second lamp emits a color different than a color emitted by the first lamp when the terminal is in a GPS mode and the first lamp indicates a left-turn or right-turn, and the lamps operate in a normal incoming call indication mode when the lamps do not indicate a left-turn or right-turn, as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Hama et al., Yamada and Bradley et al. fail disclose all the features of Claim

1. Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-4 and 9, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on Claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-4 and 9 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-5 and 7-9, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: June 30, 2006

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/JWK